DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 384 324 HE 028 437

AUTHOR Jones, Lesley; And Others
TITLE Strategic Plan Development for Recruitment of a Diverse Faculty: A Report from the EAPS Committee on Faculty Diversity. Review of the Literature. Departmental Self-study. Conclusions and Recommendations.
PUB DATE Dec 93
NOTE 83p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; College Students; Departments; Educational Administration; *Faculty Recruitment; Higher Education; Psychological Services; School Holding Power; *Self Evaluation (Groups); *Strategic Planning; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Diversity (Faculty); *Southwest Texas State University

ABSTRACT

The Committee on Faculty Diversity at Southwest Texas State University (STSU) did research and evaluation in order to recommend strategies for recruiting a more diverse faculty in the Department of Educational Administration and Psychological Services (EAPS). The committee initially collected and reviewed pertinent literature on diversity definitions and strategies for increasing and maintaining diversity. The committee then conducted a formal survey of the students and faculty of the Department of EAPS on their perceptions of faculty diversity throughout the department. Based on the findings and on the literature review a tentative concrete definition of diversity for the Department was developed which established gender and ethnicity as immediate primary criteria for diversity, and differences in theoretical orientation, chronological age, and years of experience as secondary criteria for diversity. Finally, 23 strategies for increasing and maintaining diversity among the faculty were proposed. Some of these recommendations were: (1) conduct cultural awareness sessions for faculty and students; (2) adapt curricula to include diversity and multiculturalism as strands running through all courses; and (3) mentor graduate students from diverse backgrounds and actively encourage them to pursue doctoral studies. Appendixes contain study questionnaires and tabular presentations of the faculty responses to each item. (Contains 25 references.) (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 384 324

HE

Strategic Plan Development for Recruitment of a Diverse Faculty: A Report From the EAPS Committee on Faculty Diversity

Review of the Literature
Departmental Self-study
Conclusions and Recommendations

Submitted by

Lesley Jones, John Garcia, Linda Avila, Barbara Lyman,
Claire Usher, and Marilee Mayhew

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lesley Jones

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

December, 1993

Funded, in part, by a Creative/Scholarly grant from the College of Education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE028437

Table of Contents

Review of the Literature 1

The Concept of Diversity 1

Problematic aspects of contemporary usage of the term "diversity." 2

From legal remedy and demographic imperative to a reflective practice approach 3

Strategies to Increase and Maintain Diversity in a Faculty 5

Long-term recruitment strategies. 5

Short-term recruitment strategies. 6

Retention strategies 7

Methodology 8

Participants Surveyed 8

Table 1 Distribution of Faculty Participants 10

Table 2 Distribution of Graduate Student Participants 11

Instruments 12

Student and faculty questionnaires. 12

Table 3 Eigenvalues of Final Reduced Correlation Matrix 12

Table 4 Item Content and Factor Loadings from Varimax Rotation 13

Data Analysis 14

Results 14

Table 5 Means and Standard Deviations for Graduate Student and Faculty Responses to Each Item and the Five Subscales 15

Table 6 The Means and Standard Deviations of the Ten Items Most Extremely Endorsed by Graduate Students and Faculty Members 16

Table 7 The Equalized Scores Associated with the Five Subscales by Groups 17

Table 8 Analysis of Variance of Graduate Student IOD Scores by 18

Table 9 Graduate Student IOD Means by Program Areas 18

Table 10 Item Content, Means and Standard Deviation of Graduate Student and Faculty Responses to the Items on the CAD Scale 19

Table 11 Analysis of Variance of Graduate Student CAD Scores 19
Table 12 Graduate Student CAD Means by Program Areas and Gender 20
Table 13 Analysis of Variance of Graduate Student ETH by Ethnic Origin 20
Table 14 Analysis of Variance of Graduate Student ETH Scores by Program Area 20
Table 15 Means and Standard Deviations of Graduate Student 21
Table 16 Graduate Student ETH Means by Program Areas 21
Table 17 Means and Standard Deviations for Graduate Student and Faculty Responses to the Items on the PLD Scale 22
Table 18 Analysis of Variance of Graduate Student IOF Scores by Program Area 23
Table 19 Graduate Student IOF Means by Program Areas 23
Discussion 23
Present diversity of faculty and students in EAPS 23
The importance of faculty diversity 24
Factors seen as constituting diversity 25
The perceived level of diversity among current faculty 26
The impact of faculty on the students' multicultural perspectives 27
Summary and limitations 27
Recommendations for the Department 28
References 32
Appendix A Student Questionnaire 34
Appendix B Faculty Questionnaire 39
Appendix C Descriptive Summary of the Faculty's Responses to Each Item 44

REPORT FROM THE EAPS COMMITTEE ON FACULTY DIVERSITY

The purpose of the Committee on Faculty Diversity was to contribute to the University's goal of developing and implementing a strategic plan relative to the recruitment of a diverse and high quality faculty. Its contribution was to be the development of a plan for the Department of Educational Administration and Psychological Services (EAPS) -- a plan that would be integrated into the broader plans of both the School of Education and Southwest Texas State University. The committee identified as its objectives the following: (a) to consult the extant education literature relative to faculty diversity, (b) to create a working definition of "diversity," (c) to systematically examine the perceptions of diversity held by the faculty and students in the Department of EAPS, (d) to examine the current state of diversity amongst the EAPS faculty, and (e) to provide recommendations for use by the department and the university's administrators.

The committee initially collected and reviewed pertinent literature regarding the concept of diversity. An operational definition of the term "diversity" has important implications for how this construct is studied and implemented; thus, such a review was seen as critical. In addition, literature concerning strategies designed to increase and maintain diversity in a faculty were reviewed. The committee then conducted a formal survey of the students and faculty of the Department of EAPS to arrive at a better understanding of existing perceptions of faculty diversity throughout the department. The survey examined attitudes regarding the importance of faculty diversity, factors which contribute to diversity, and perceived levels of diversity among our current faculty. Based on the findings of this study and their association with already existing literature, a tentative, concrete definition of diversity is offered. Finally, strategies seen as holding potential for increasing and maintaining diversity among the faculty in our particular department, school, or the university are outlined.

It is imperative, however, that the reader keep in mind the definitional problems associated with the construct of diversity which are reviewed below. Future researchers and planners may quite appropriately need to revise or expand the definition once initial efforts begin to increase the commitment to and realization of a more diverse group of faculty members.

Review of the Literature

The Concept of Diversity

In contemporary writings on the subject, there seems to be universal agreement that enhancing diversity among faculty, staff, and students is appropriate for institutions of higher education. When controversy arises, it is generally over the operational definition of the term "diversity" and the best means for achieving it. Many articles, speeches, and book chapters elaborate on the need for diversity, and may even discuss strategies for achieving it, without first stating precisely what is and is not meant by the concept.

Varying definitions of diversity are found in the literature. This variability suggests the need to examine and clarify, if not standardize, what is meant by this construct. It is very difficult, and often impossible, to advance research, dialogue,

and action concerning diversity when writers are not careful or explicit in stating their assumptions about this concept.

The Oxford English Dictionary, Second Edition (1989), defines diversity as "The condition or quality of being diverse, different, or varied; difference; unlikeness...distinction" (p. 887). The entry also indicates that the word is derived from a Latin term meaning "contrariety, disagreement, [and] perversity." The etymology of the word "diversity," therefore, contains clearly negative connotations. As will be discussed later, in contemporary usage, the concept of diversity continues to have pejorative as well as ameliorative meanings.

Problematic aspects of contemporary usage of the term "diversity." Some writers employ the term "diversity" in delimited ways while others give the term broader scope. What this underscores is that there is no single, universally accepted idea of what constitutes diversity.

As an example of a narrow definition, one recent publication on faculty composition equated the term "diversity" with the presence of minority faculty. In fact, the concept was narrowed even more by equating minority presence with having African-American faculty. No other racial or ethnic minority was alluded to in the report (The National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities, 1991). Other articles include the four federally recognized racial/ethnic groups: African-Americans, Hispanics, Asians and Pacific Islanders, and American Indians and Alaskan Natives under the umbrella of diversity (Brown, 1988, 1989; Linthicum, 1989). The use of this more inclusive group of categories adds the consideration of language to racial or ethnic difference as a characteristic of diversity.

If we also take into account differences within minority groups, this further complicates the definition of diversity. African-American, Hispanic, Asian-American, and American Indian groups are not monolithic entities. Indeed, as Ogbu (1990) and Richardson (1989) have indicated, there can be considerable variability in conditions for and in levels of educational attainment and socioeconomic status within subgroups of minorities. Furthermore, there are considerable, though often unacknowledged, socioeconomic and cultural differences within "minority" and "majority" groups. This lack of precision in the use of terms such as minority and majority serves to highlight the definitional problems related to the concept of diversity.

Increasingly, writers on this topic have extended definitions of diversity beyond the dimensions of race and ethnicity. For instance, under affirmative action policies, protected classes include not only the four racial/ethnic groups referred to previously, but also women, the disabled, Vietnam veterans, and older adults (California Community Colleges, 1989). Under this definition, the concept of diversity becomes more pluralistic and its meaning broadens considerably in scope.

Another example of a broad definition of diversity can be found in the "Search Guidelines to Enhance Diversity" of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (1992). This document states that diversity not only includes differing ethnicity, but also "such attributes as culture, sex, age, disability, educational setting, geographic location, and language" (p. 1). Furthermore, the eight indices of diversity listed in these guidelines are intended to serve as examples and not an exhaustive taxonomy of diversity. However, this definition, while more

inclusive than those discussed earlier, is so open-ended that it may be too broad to be realistically implemented.

If the definition of diversity is extended beyond the dimensions of race and ethnicity, several questions come into focus. If not only differing ethnicity, age, educational setting, sex, geographic location, Vietnam veteran status, culture, disability, and language, but also other attributes define diversity, what are those attributes? How should they be determined? How will they be prioritized? What criteria will decide which are the most prized attributes of diversity? These are just some of the difficult questions raised by broad, open-ended definitions of diversity, such as the one employed by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.

As this brief look at representative definitions of diversity suggests, the concept is an elusive one. It is difficult to abstract from the literature a widely agreed upon definition which delineates what is and is not meant by the construct of diversity. Thus, higher education's ubiquitous goal of increasing diversity is very much a moving target and as such is made more difficult to reach.

From legal remedy and demographic imperative to a reflective practice approach. In order to arrive at a reasonable framework for defining diversity, it is helpful to be reminded of the history of civil rights and the quest for equal opportunity in the United States at the federal level. Federal laws, executive orders, agency regulations, and judicial rulings promulgated in order to promote or uphold diversity in higher education and other institutions can be subdivided into two groups according to their main purpose. Some of the policies which emerged were established in an attempt to compensate for *de jure* and *de facto* exclusion, that is, decades and indeed centuries of legally and/or socially sanctioned discrimination. Affirmative action policies and programs fall into this category. They were established, not to obtain preferential treatment for minority groups, but "to redress historical inequities and correct imbalances which have resulted from practices favoring white males in the workplace" (Lessow-Hurley, 1989, p. 23).

The term "diversity", identified as it is with such policies and programs as affirmative action, "immediately calls up images of quotas and preferential treatment, and the concept is often quickly and inaccurately summed up as 'reverse discrimination' " (Henry, 1987, as cited by Lessow-Hurley, 1989). A common fear of incumbent faculty in institutions of higher education is that affirmative action means that less than qualified minority faculty must be hired and/or retained. Such inaccurate interpretations of affirmative action initiatives have also contributed to the negative connotations of the concept of diversity.

However, in contradistinction to affirmative action and its remedial purpose, equal employment opportunity (EEO) policies at the federal level were developed for the primary purpose of prohibiting discrimination. For example, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 bans discrimination in employment based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. In other words, EEO policies are preventative while affirmative action policies are curative. Neither cancels out the other. The two simply have different basic purposes (Lessow-Hurley, 1989).

Institutions of higher education and units within them, such as individual departments, have choices about the stances and strategies which they adopt toward issues of affirmative action, equal opportunity, and diversity. One common response has been for institutions to reflect the positions of federal affirmative

action and equal employment opportunity policies. Some colleges and universities have barely lived up to the letter of laws, regulations, and rulings, while others have attempted to capture the spirit as well (Henry, 1985). However, in both cases, institutional action has usually been driven by outside forces and externally derived policies.

Institutions have alternatives to following the lead of civil government. These alternative perspectives include the demographic imperative (Ozawa, 1986, as cited by Gibbs, Huang, & Associates, 1989) and the reflective practice approach (Schon, 1983).

The demographic imperative refers to the projection that sometime in the next century whites will become a minority population in the United States (The Hudson Institute, Inc., as cited by Kappner, 1991). Discussions of the demographic imperative often convey a sense of urgency. Many who invoke it say that the education enterprise is already far behind in preparing for this inevitable change (e.g., Ching, 1990; Kappner, 1991). However, what is significant for the purpose of this discussion is that calls for increasing diversity in higher education which are driven by demographic projections stem more from perceived external pressure than from leadership within institutions of higher education themselves.

A contrasting, and more productive, perspective for policy making and action regarding diversity on college campuses is the reflective action or deliberative approach (see Schon, 1983). Proponents of this approach do not ignore the need to remedy past discrimination by pursuing affirmative action. Nor do they diminish the need to prohibit further discrimination by promoting equal employment opportunity. Both efforts are necessary, for as Richardson (1989) observed, we live in a nation where discrimination based on color was the law of the land for hundreds of years. How likely is it, given this history, that just outcomes will emerge if we rely on "color-free" approaches alone?

Along with the need to pursue affirmative action and equal employment opportunity, there is also a need to address the demographic imperative. Stakeholders in institutions of higher education, however, must not limit their approaches to diversity by responding only to pressures from outside the university. Instead, using a reflective action or deliberative approach, the university and its constituents can employ self-examination, research, and reflective practice. These are prerequisites for a proactive rather than a reactive stance towards achieving diversity.

The framework for this study represents an attempt to use such a reflective action approach. This effort includes "The struggle to define the situation, and thereby to determine the direction of public policy, [which] is always both intellectual and political. Views of reality are both cognitive constructs, which make the situation understandable in a certain way, and instruments of political power...[P]roblem setting, policy definition and interpretation of the situation... are always marked by intellectual inquiry and political contention" (Schon, 1983, p. 348). Recognition of this relation between intellectual inquiry and political contention shapes the perspective from which diversity is approached in this study. With this caveat as part of the framework, this study proceeds to examine definitions and perceptions of diversity held by the constituents of one academic department, namely the Department of Educational Administration and Psychological Services.

Rather than begin with preconceived or imposed definitions of diversity, one goal of the committee was to survey students and faculty from each of the four program areas within EAPS (i.e., our departmental and program "stakeholders"). This survey was designed to assist the committee in determining existing perceptions of the importance of faculty diversity, the factors which contribute to diversity, and the department's present, perceived level of diversity. Using these perceptions to derive a definition for diversity, the committee then set out to craft a strategic plan to diversify the faculty of the department. This planning was based on a review of the practices used at other post-secondary institutions to enhance faculty diversity. This review is summarized below.

Strategies to Increase and Maintain Diversity in a Faculty

A review of the literature in the area of faculty diversity presents a broad range of varied and practical ideas that have proven successful in different settings. These ideas stretch from secondary school level, "grow-your-own" recruitment strategies, to maintenance and support strategies that enable nontraditional faculty members to survive and succeed in a higher education environment. The literature seems to be organized into two arenas: recruitment practices and retention strategies. Furthermore, in the area of recruitment, there are mechanisms which extend along a continuum from short- to long-term, with short-term concerns centering around filling current vacancies and long-term issues focusing on ways to enlarge the potential pool of diverse faculty (The National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities, 1991).

The central undergirding notion is that the recruitment and retention of diverse faculty members must be only one small piece of the whole plan to develop and maintain multiculturalism across the entire university, for example, in areas like curriculum, student body, and institutional norms (Arciniega, 1990). In a pluralistic society, post-secondary education should value all diversity and serve as a model to the rest of society. Support from the highest levels of university administration is critical to this effort. Therefore, plans that seek to enhance faculty diversity without addressing student diversity, curriculum differentiation, and institutional norms are doomed to failure.

Long-term recruitment strategies. Recruitment strategies often begin when a search for a faculty position is initiated, but they should be implemented long before this point. Extensive preplanning involving active recruitment of diverse students in high schools, undergraduate programs, and graduate schools is needed to insure that sufficient numbers of qualified, diverse faculty members will exist (Moses, 1989). In this way, institutions can insure themselves high-quality minority candidates if they invest the time and effort to "grow" their own by mentoring and guiding high school and college students into careers in higher education.

Equally as challenging is fostering cultures within universities that value diversity and seek to enhance, as opposed to simply tolerate, diversity in their own settings. An aspect of this effort revolves around convincing current faculty, department by department, that diversity is important and may require constant training in multiculturalism (Linthicum, 1989). Another part of this challenge entails creating a collegial atmosphere in which all faculty, regardless of their

"roots," are seen as fully qualified for their positions and respected for their contributions (Moses, 1989).

In terms of building the pool from which to draw this mosaic of faculty, several actions can be taken. Inviting minority faculty members from other universities to be visiting scholars or participants in exchange programs can create a network which can be tapped later as faculty vacancies occur (Scott, 1992). An even more effective method involves hiring minority adjunct faculty; this strategy increases the diversity to which the students are exposed while also providing the adjunct faculty member encouragement to apply for full-time positions or to nominate others (Linthicum, 1989). Networking with local, state, and national minority groups and maintaining those relationships will provide the university with access to their memberships when faculty positions open. It will also enable those groups to recommend candidates (Scott, 1992). Industry and community organizations may be approached to lend some of their professionals from diverse backgrounds to the university on a temporary basis; later these professionals may consider applying themselves or nominating someone else for faculty openings (Mazingo, 1987). Research into (a) the actual numbers of potential candidates available, such as numbers of doctoral degrees granted in a particular field to minority group members, and (b) the institutions which grant those degrees in high numbers may give direction to a department as it seeks to fill vacancies in the future; however, for this information to be useful, it will require constant updating (California Community Colleges: Chancellor's Office, 1989). Along the same lines, maintenance of an applicant tracking system will allow a university to retrieve information on candidates from previous searches, particularly if this data bank is kept current through occasional contact with those candidates (Linthicum, 1989).

Short-term recruitment strategies. When an actual search is implemented, the first task of the search committee should be the training of its members by personnel in the affirmative action office or another body with similar commitments and skills. Such training should not only attempt to insure fairness and guarantee that all laws, policies, and procedures are observed, but it should also expand the thinking of search committees on ways to recruit a more diverse pool of candidates. The affirmative action staff or a similar group can be instrumental in educating search committee members about the possibilities that candidates from diverse groups offer. Such candidates may fail to impress the committee based on the "paper" qualifications and may require a deeper investigation before being eliminated from the pool (Arciniega, 1990). Search committee members need to know that although certain candidates may have fewer publications or fewer official qualifications, they may still bring with them qualities that other candidates lack, such as different perspectives in their fields or different background experiences that will be valuable in their relationships with students (Henry, 1985). The search committee should take on the attitude of "searching" as opposed to simply "screening" (Scott, 1992).

Examples of short term search strategies include:

1. Contacting minority groups on campus and minority alumni to solicit nominations from them (Mazingo, 1987);

2. Writing job descriptions as broadly as possible so as to encourage many applicants (Arciniega, 1990);
3. Questioning the qualifications commonly expected for a position and exploring the issue of whether or not a candidate with fewer or different qualifications can carry out the assigned tasks. For example, must all faculty possess doctorates, especially if the primary focus of a particular position is on teaching? (Bunzel, 1990);
4. Including in the advertisement statements that demonstrate respect for diversity beyond the stale statements to meet EEO (Equal Employment Opportunity) requirements (Arciniega, 1990);
5. Brainstorming with other departments, such as the affirmative action office, about nontraditional ways to recruit and different networks with which to communicate (California Community Colleges: Chancellor's Office, 1989);
6. Mailing the advertisement to female and minority faculty at other universities to solicit their applications or their nominations of other candidates (Lessow-Hurley, 1989);
7. Setting screening criteria so that they avoid disenfranchising the minority candidates (Astin, 1982);
8. Sending the advertisement to minority professional organizations and universities which have large numbers of minority students (Linthicum, 1989);
9. Closing down searches when the pool does not exhibit the level of diversity desired (Linthicum, 1989); and
10. Interviewing minority candidates in ways that inform them fully about tenure and promotion expectations, as well as answer their questions about personal and family concerns (e.g. housing, schools, opportunities for community involvement) (Astin, 1982).

Retention strategies. Once a faculty member is in position, retention practices become vital not only to that faculty member to insure her/his success but also to other potential candidates as a sign that the particular institution values diversity and engages in behaviors that model that valuing. A reputation as a pluralistic institution enhances the institution's future ability to attract a diverse faculty as well as a diverse student body. The following retention strategies are noteworthy.

1. To assist the new faculty members, the assignment of mentor faculty has been established as critical (Arciniega, 1990).
2. Connecting these new faculty with minority organizations and support groups will enable them to form networks (Lessow-Hurley, 1989).
3. Compensation packages that keep pace with other institutions will obviously impact a faculty member's decision to remain at a university. Other resources, such as support for research, attendance at professional meetings and recognition for achievements, can also play an important role in retaining a faculty member from a diverse background (Astin, 1982).

4. A common problem for women and minority faculty is that their time for research is often constricted by two factors: their appointment to an inordinate number of committees and task forces (to represent under-represented groups) and large amounts of time spent in service activities, such as mentoring minority students, that are seen as best performed by them. Both of these factors can result in less research for women and minority faculty and consequently, in lower rates of attaining tenure and receiving promotions (Menges & Exum, 1983). Consequently, institutions must either make allowances in policies for these situations or carefully monitor the burdens for service placed on these faculty members to give them the time needed to conduct research.
5. Finally, the creation of a collegial atmosphere will support the new faculty members as they network with others and seek opportunities to collaborate in research, publishing, and other professional activities, thus reducing the stress on them as individuals to meet expectations (Moses, 1989).

Taken together, these ideas paint a broad picture of a continuous effort on the part of a post-secondary institution to widen its diversity. To be effective, these efforts must be systemic and intentional rather than random; they must be a part of the identity of the institution and built into its daily procedures and operating policies.

Clearly many of the above recommendations hold promise for this committee's goal of defining a strategic plan to recruit a diverse, high quality faculty. As stated earlier, however, it seems imperative that first, the situation be defined (i.e., how do current students and faculty view the importance of diversity, what variables do they see as constituting diversity, and what is their perception of the department's present level of diversity?). The methodology used to ascertain answers to these questions and the results of this research follow.

Methodology

Participants Surveyed

The persons solicited to participate in this survey included 18 full-time faculty members and the students enrolled in their courses during the Spring semester 1993. All participants were told that a departmental committee was surveying students and faculty regarding their opinions about faculty diversity. The survey was distributed in regularly scheduled classes and participants were told to avoid revealing their names or identification numbers. They were also instructed not to complete a survey if they had done so in another class.

Two groups were included in the final analysis. The first group consisted of nine faculty members and the second group consisted of 229 graduate students. One additional faculty member and 64 additional graduate students turned their surveys in after the initial analysis was completed. These data were judged to be too small in number to substantially change the overall results, so further data analysis was not conducted and these data were not included. In addition, 25 undergraduate student surveys were received, but the results of the analysis of these surveys were not included because the department's main thrust is directed toward graduate students. In addition, no significant differences were found between

undergraduate and graduate students on the variable evaluating the department's perceived level of diversity. This variable is described in the section entitled "Instruments."

Table 1 presents the distribution of the faculty participants across seven demographic variables. It indicates that the sample was an all white, non-disabled group all of whom listed English as their principal language. Women comprised 89 percent of the sample and 11 percent were men. This does not reflect the actual gender ratio of those initially requested to participate which was 50-50. It also does not reflect the ethnic distribution of the faculty which is 5.5 percent African-American, 5.5 percent Hispanic and 89 percent Caucasian. The distribution of those responding, based on the program areas with which they were affiliated, was similar to the actual distribution of faculty within the department. Thirty-three percent of the 18 faculty solicited for participation were affiliated with Educational Administration and contributed 44 percent of the completed surveys. Forty-four percent of the faculty who were invited to participate belonged to the Counseling and Guidance area and contributed 33 percent of the completed surveys. School Psychology and Developmental Education each represented 11 percent of the faculty and contributed 11 percent of the surveys analyzed. All age groups of the population surveyed and all years of service categories were represented.

Table 2 presents the distribution of the graduate students across seven similar demographic variables. It indicates that 69 percent of the sample were female and 31 percent were male. This distribution is very similar to the Fall 1992 EAPS enrollment: 73% female, 27% male (Office of Institutional Research and Planning, personal communication, February 9, 1994). While still predominantly white and English speaking, a more diverse representation of ethnic groups and principal languages was found than that seen in the faculty sample. Caucasians comprised 86 percent of the graduate student sample, 6 percent were African-American, 5 percent were Hispanic, and 3 percent cited "Other." No Asian Americans were represented. Again, this distribution reflects the ethnic composition of the EAPS graduate students in Fall 1992: 85% Caucasian, 6% African-American, 9% Hispanic, and 1% "Other" (Office of Institutional Research and Planning, personal communication, February 9, 1994). English was the principal language for 97 percent, 2 percent marked Spanish, and 0.4 percent cited "Other." Eight percent of the student sample indicated that they had a disability. The distribution among program areas was as follows: 51 percent were members of the Counseling and Guidance area, 28 percent were from Educational Administration, 11 percent were in the School Psychology program, 6 percent cited "Other," and 4 percent were affiliated with Developmental Education. "Other" under program area indicates that the student was enrolled in EAPS courses but not majoring in any of the department's program areas. Educational Administration students appear to have been underrepresented in the student sample because they comprised 42% of the EAPS enrollment in Fall 1992. Counseling and Guidance students comprised 42% of the enrollment, School Psychology 12%, and Developmental Education, 3% (Office of Institutional Research and Planning, personal communication, February 9, 1994).

It appears that the use of opscan forms dissuaded students from filling in the blanks on the questionnaire marked "Other," so we are unable to determine the exact nature of the answers which were so marked.

Table 1
Distribution of Faculty Participants

Demographic Variable		Number	%
Gender	Female	8	88.89
	Male	1	11.11
	TOTAL	9	100.00
Ethnic Origin	Caucasian	9	100.00
	African-American	0	0.00
	Hispanic	0	0.00
	Asian American	0	0.00
	Other	0	0.00
	TOTAL	9	100.00
Age	31-40	2	22.22
	41-50	5	55.56
	51-60	1	11.11
	60+	1	11.11
	TOTAL	9	100.00
Program	Educational Administration	4	44.44
	Counseling and Guidance	3	33.33
	School Psychology	1	11.11
	Developmental Education	1	11.11
	TOTAL	9	100.00
Years of Service	0-5	4	44.44
	6-10	1	11.11
	10-15	1	11.11
	16-20	2	22.22
	20+	1	11.11
	TOTAL	9	100.00
Disability	Yes	0	0.00
	No	9	100.00
	TOTAL	9	100.00
Principal Language	English	9	100.00
	Spanish	0	0.00
	Other	0	0.00
	TOTAL	9	100.00

Table 2
Distribution of Graduate Student Participants

Demographic Variable		Number	%
Gender	Female	159	69.43
	Male	70	30.57
	TOTAL	229	100.00
Ethnic Origin	Caucasian	197	86.03
	African-American	14	6.11
	Hispanic	11	4.80
	Asian American	0	0.00
	Other	7	3.06
	TOTAL	229	100.00
Age	20-30	68	29.82
	31-40	80	35.09
	41-50	68	29.82
	51-60	11	4.82
	60+	1	0.44
	TOTAL	229	100.00
Program	Educational Administration	65	28.38
	Counseling and Guidance	116	50.66
	School Psychology	25	10.92
	Developmental Education	9	3.93
	Other	14	6.11
	TOTAL	229	100.00
# Semester Hours Completed	0-9	68	31.48
	10-18	48	22.22
	19-27	32	14.81
	28-37	38	17.59
	39-45	30	13.89
	TOTAL	216	100.00
Disability	yes	19	8.33
	no	209	91.67
	TOTAL	228	100.00
Principal Language	English	222	97.37
	Spanish	5	2.19
	Other	1	0.44
	TOTAL	228	100.00

Instruments

Student and faculty questionnaires. These questionnaires were developed by the committee based on University documents and a review of the literature. They are presented in Appendices A and B. The items were designed to address demographic data, the importance of faculty diversity, the variables seen as contributing to diversity, and the participants' perceptions of the department's present level of diversity.

Items 1 through 7 of these surveys addressed the demographic data which are summarized in Tables 1 and 2. These data were identical for both students and faculty with two exceptions: (a) item 5 asked faculty how many years they had been in their profession while asking students how many semester hours they had completed, and (b) item 4 offered four age groups to faculty and five age groups to students (the 20-30 age group was added to the student questionnaire).

Items 8 through 43 were statements to which the participant was to indicate A for "strongly disagree," B for "disagree," C for "undecided," D for "agree," and E for "strongly agree." A, B, C, D, and E were scored 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 respectively. These items addressed three broad areas, and three dependent variables were formed by summing the scores from the items associated with those areas. Items 8, 13, 15, and 40 addressed the importance of diversity and created the variable entitled Importance of Diversity; items 12, 14, 15, 25, 30, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, and 42 were intended to assess what characteristics are attributed to diversity and were summed to form Critical Attributes of Diversity. Items 9, 10, 11, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 41, and 43 were designed to evaluate the department's current, perceived level of diversity and sensitivity to issues associated with diversity, and the scores of these items were summed to form the variable Perceived Level of Diversity. The internal reliability of the instrument was examined using Chronbach's alpha and was found to be adequate (0.77).

A principal factor analysis of the graduate student responses to items 8 through 43 (N = 232) using a varimax rotation resulted in the identification of four factors. The eigenvalues for those factors which were retained are presented in Table 3. Factor retention was based on eigenvalues greater than or equal to 1. The factor loadings from the varimax rotation and the specific items associated with each factor are presented in Table 4 in sorted order..

Table 3
Eigenvalues of Final Reduced Correlation Matrix

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Factor 1	4.74	37.9	37.9
Factor 2	3.72	29.8	67.7
Factor 3	2.68	21.5	89.2
Factor 4	1.35	10.8	100.0

Table 4
Item Content and Factor Loadings from Varimax Rotation

Factor Loading	Item Number	Item Content
		FACTOR 1
0.71	Q29	The members of the faculty are not sensitive to the issues of handicapped persons.
0.68	Q21	The members of the faculty are not sensitive to the issues of the elderly.
0.66	Q24	The faculty is not sensitive to women's issues.
0.63	Q34	The members of the faculty are not sensitive to men's issues.
0.44	Q32	There are not enough Caucasians on the faculty.
	Variance	3.45
		FACTOR 2
0.68	Q36	Diversity includes difference by ethnicity.
0.62	Q30	Diversity includes difference by chronological age.
0.58	Q37	Diversity includes number of years of experience in field.
0.55	Q13	Diversity is desirable in the graduate faculty.
0.55	Q38	Having faculty with varying years of experience in the field is desirable.
0.52	Q12	Diversity includes difference by educational background (i.e., training and philosophy).
0.51	Q25	Gender is an important consideration in measuring diversity.
0.49	Q15	Having faculty members with varying theoretical orientations is important to me.
0.43	Q39	Primary language is an important element of diversity.
	Variance	3.37
		FACTOR 3
0.66	Q22	There are not enough Hispanics on the faculty.
0.64	Q18	There are not enough African-Americans on the faculty.
-0.49	Q23	The faculty are not culturally diverse.
-0.47	Q17	The faculty is multicultural.
-0.46	Q32	There are not enough Caucasians on the faculty.
0.46	Q08	The diversity of the faculty is important to me.
	Variance	2.95
		FACTOR 4
0.70	Q27	The diversity of the faculty has motivated me to think about issues from multiple perspectives.
0.70	Q26	The faculty's diversity has assisted me in developing skills to work with diverse populations.
0.67	Q35	The faculty has challenged me to examine my own multi-cultural perspectives.
0.52	Q10	My experience with the faculty has helped me foster an appreciation for a variety of cultures other than my own.
0.51	Q16	One reason I chose my program is because of the diversity of the faculty.
	Variance	2.72

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Based on these analyses, the Critical Attributes of Diversity scale was revised (items 14, 40, and 42 were dropped from the original scale) and achieved a reliability coefficient of 0.76. Two additional variables were identified: Ethnicity consisting of items 17, 18, 22, 23, and 32 and Impact of Faculty consisting of items 10, 16, 26, 27, and 35. In summing the scores on the Ethnicity subscale, items 17 and 32 were scored in the reverse order (i.e., A=5, B=4, C=3, D=2, E=1). When scored in this manner the reliability coefficient for the ETH scale was 0.77. The Impact of Faculty subscale was scored in the usual manner and achieved a reliability of 0.76. The original scales of Importance of Diversity and Perceived Level of Diversity achieved alpha scores of 0.67 and 0.66 respectively.

Data Analysis

The responses for each item on the student and faculty questionnaires were summarized using descriptive statistics. Scores on the Importance of Diversity (IOD), Critical Attributes of Diversity (CAD), and Perceived Level of Diversity (PLD) variables as well as the two additional variables of Ethnicity (ETH) and Impact of Faculty (IOF) were calculated. Finally data from these five subscales were evaluated for the graduate student sample using analysis of variance procedures for the following independent variables: gender, program area, ethnic origin, age, disability, and principal language. Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey's test were calculated when indicated by the previous analysis with alpha set at the .05 level. Analysis of variance could not be used to evaluate the faculty's responses due to the small sample size. A descriptive summary of the graduate student and faculty responses to each item is presented in Table 5. A summary of the frequencies and percentages of faculty by gender, age and years of service is presented in Appendix C.

Results

The means and standard deviations from both graduate student and faculty responses on each of the items and on the five subscales are presented in Table 5. The top ten items which the graduate students most extremely endorsed (i.e. agreed or disagreed with most strongly) as well as the ten items which the faculty most extremely endorsed are listed in Table 6. It should be noted that these items are listed in order of greatest distance from the "undecided" response so that the strength of an item's endorsement, not the direction of the endorsement, determined its rank. In addition, the average item response scores associated with the five subscales (i.e., the total score divided by the number of items on that scale) are listed in Table 7.

Scores on the IOD subscale from the graduate student sample ranged from 4 to 20. Statistics calculated on these responses (N = 223) resulted in a mean of 15.32 (S. D. = 2.81). Scores on this variable from the faculty sample (N = 9) ranged from 16 to 18 with a mean of 16.89 and a standard deviation of 1.05.

Graduate students' scores on the CAD subscale ranged from 8 to 40 . The 221 observations on this scale resulted in a mean of 30.10 (S. D. = 4.39). Faculty scores on this variable (N = 9) ranged from 27 to 33 with calculations on these data resulting in a mean of 31.22 (S. D. = 1.79).

Table 5
Means and Standard Deviations for Graduate Student and Faculty Responses to Each Item and the Five Subscales

	Graduate Students			Faculty		
Variable	N	Mean	S. D.	N	Mean	S. D.
Q8	228	3.81	1.12	9	4.11	0.60
Q9	227	3.60	1.01	9	4.22	0.44
Q10	228	3.17	1.05	9	3.44	1.13
Q11	229	2.21	0.91	9	1.67	.050
Q12	229	4.05	0.75	9	4.11	0.33
Q13	228	4.19	0.84	9	4.56	0.53
Q14	228	2.36	1.05	9	2.67	1.23
Q15	229	4.04	0.92	9	4.33	0.50
Q16	227	2.10	0.97	9	2.44	1.33
Q17	228	2.67	1.03	9	2.44	0.88
Q18	228	3.47	1.17	9	4.00	0.71
Q19	226	2.55	0.86	9	3.22	1.09
Q20	227	3.21	0.99	9	3.89	0.78
Q21	228	2.55	0.78	9	2.56	0.73
Q22	228	3.23	1.04	9	3.22	0.97
Q23	227	3.14	0.98	9	3.56	0.88
Q24	227	2.35	0.89	9	3.11	1.05
Q25	226	3.61	1.08	9	3.78	0.67
Q26	227	3.09	0.96	9	2.89	0.93
Q27	227	3.39	1.02	9	3.44	1.13
Q28	227	2.72	0.94	9	2.67	1.00
Q29	227	2.49	0.79	9	2.67	1.00
Q30	227	3.74	0.88	9	4.00	0.00
Q31	226	2.98	1.04	9	2.56	0.73
Q32	226	2.02	0.84	9	2.00	0.87
Q33	225	2.46	0.96	9	2.44	0.88
Q34	224	2.49	0.80	9	2.78	0.97
Q35	225	3.44	1.11	9	3.00	1.00
Q36	226	4.00	0.87	9	4.00	0.00
Q37	226	3.67	0.90	9	3.67	0.71
Q38	224	3.92	0.87	9	3.89	0.60
Q39	225	3.08	1.02	9	3.44	0.88
Q40	225	3.31	1.07	9	3.89	0.93
Q41	220	2.51	0.89	9	3.11	0.78
Q42	219	2.95	1.30	9	3.44	1.24
Q43	220	2.62	1.03	9	2.11	0.78
IOD	223	15.32	2.81	9	16.89	1.05
PLD	208	64.60	6.94	9	67.44	7.78
CAD	221	30.10	4.39	9	31.22	1.79
ETH	225	17.13	3.59	9	18.33	2.35
IOF	222	15.17	3.64	9	15.22	4.68

Table 6
The Means and Standard Deviations of the Ten Items Most Extremely Endorsed by Graduate Students and Faculty Members

Item Content		N	Mean	S. D.	D*
	Graduate Students				
13.	Diversity is desirable in the graduate faculty.	228	4.19	0.84	1.19
12.	Diversity includes difference by educational background (i.e., training and philosophy).	229	4.05	0.75	1.05
15.	Having faculty members with varying theoretical orientations is important to me.	229	4.04	0.92	1.04
36.	Diversity includes difference by ethnicity.	226	4.00	0.87	1.00
38.	Having faculty with varying years of experience in the field is desirable.	224	3.92	0.87	.92
32.	There are not enough Caucasians on the faculty.	226	2.09	0.84	.91
8.	The diversity of the faculty is important to me.	228	3.81	1.21	.81
11.	There are not enough males on the faculty.	229	2.21	0.91	.79
37.	Diversity includes number of years of experience in the field.	226	3.67	0.90	.67
14.	Tenure increases a faculty member's credibility with students.	228	2.36	1.05	.64
	Faculty				
13.	Diversity is desirable in the graduate faculty.	9	4.56	0.53	1.56
15.	Having faculty members with varying theoretical orientations is important to me.	9	4.33	0.50	1.33
11.	There are not enough males on the faculty.	9	1.67	0.50	1.33
9.	My faculty represents a wide spectrum of theoretical orientations.	9	4.22	0.44	1.22
8.	The diversity of the faculty is important to me.	9	4.11	0.60	1.11
12.	Diversity includes difference by educational background (i.e., training and philosophy).	9	4.11	0.33	1.11
18.	There are not enough African-Americans on the faculty.	9	4.00	0.71	1.00
30.	Diversity includes difference by chronological age.	9	4.00	0.00	1.00
32.	There are not enough Caucasians on the faculty.	9	2.00	0.87	1.00
36.	Diversity includes difference by ethnicity.	9	4.00	0.00	1.00

* Distance from undecided

Table 7
The Equalized Scores Associated with the Five Subscales by Groups

Subscale	Graduate Student Mean	Faculty Mean
IOD	3.83	4.22
CAD	3.76	3.90
ETH	3.43	3.66
IOF	3.03	3.04
PLD	2.81	2.93

Graduate students' scores on the PLD (N = 208) subscale ranged from 23 to 79 with a mean of 64.60 (S. D. = 6.94). Faculty scores (N = 9) on this subscale ranged from 53 to 79 with a mean of 76.44 (S. D. = 7.8).

The ETH subscale scores from the graduate student sample (N = 225) ranged from 7 to 25 with a mean of 17.13 (S. D. = 3.59). Faculty scores (N = 9) ranged from 15 to 22 and demonstrated a mean of 18.33 (S. D. = 2.35).

Graduate student responses on the IOF subscale ranged from 5 to 25. The mean and standard deviation for IOF (N = 222) were 15.17 and 3.64 respectively. The faculty's scores on this scale ranged from 9 to 21 with a mean of 15.22 and a standard deviation of 4.68 (N = 9).

In examining the subscales, one-way ANOVAs revealed that no significant differences existed between the faculty responses and those of the graduate students. However, due to the small size of the faculty group, these findings must be viewed as inconclusive. In addition, further analysis of the faculty data was not possible. Data from the two groups were not pooled based on the large difference in the sample sizes and the varying roles and backgrounds of the two groups. Data from the graduate student respondents, however, were evaluated using analysis of variance with alpha set at the .05 level. Only the variables of gender, ethnic origin and program were found to have significant effects.

Table 8 presents the results of an analysis of variance in which the independent variables were gender and program area and the dependent variable was IOD. The small sample size of the program areas of Developmental Educational and Other prohibited an examination of these two groups in this analysis. The results of the analysis of variance indicated that scores on the IOD subscale differed significantly based on the program ($p < .01$) but not the gender of the respondent and that no interaction effect was present. The means of these three program areas are presented in Table 9. A pairwise comparison of these means (using Tukey's test) indicated that students from the Counseling and Guidance program scored higher (i.e., more strongly endorsed the importance of faculty diversity) than did students in Educational Administration ($p < .01$) but did not score significantly higher than those in School Psychology.

Table 8
Analysis of Variance of Graduate Student IOD Scores by Gender and Program Area

Source	df	MS	F	P
Between subjects	199			
Gender	1	0.74	0.10	0.78
Program	2	44.27	5.71	0.00
Gender X Program	2	8.72	1.12	0.33

Table 9
Graduate Student IOD Means by Program Areas

Gender	N	Mean	S. D.
Female	139	15.36	2.92
Male	61	15.49	2.70
Program Area	**N**	**Mean**	**S. D.**
Educational Administration	65	14.48	2.91
Counseling & Guidance	112	15.95	2.69
School Psychology	23	15.35	2.82
Overall	200	15.40	2.85

The means and standard deviations from both graduate student and faculty responses to the items on the Critical Attributes of Diversity (CAD) Scale are summarized in Table 10.

These rank orderings are remarkably parallel. Both groups identify educational background and theoretical orientation as their top two attributes of diversity. These are followed by ethnicity, years of experience, age, and gender. Both the graduate students and faculty tend to be undecided about the importance of primary language as an element of diversity. Diversity, therefore, is defined similarly by both groups, and includes educational background, theoretical orientation, ethnicity, chronological age, years of experience and gender.

A 2×3 analysis of variance was performed with the CAD subscale as the dependent variable and gender and program area as the independent variables. Data from this analysis and the means by program area are presented in Tables 11 and 12 respectively. Table 11 indicates that scores on this subscale differed significantly due to the effects of program area affiliation ($p < .01$) and gender ($p < .05$). Pairwise comparisons of the means of these groups indicated that women scored higher than men and Counseling and Guidance students scored higher than those in

the Education Administration category ($p < .01$) but not significantly higher than School Psychology students. Therefore, women and Counseling and Guidance and School Psychology students more strongly endorsed this set of attributes, i.e., this definition of diversity.

Table 10
Item Content, Means and Standard Deviation of Graduate Student and Faculty Responses to the Items on the CAD Scale

Item	Graduate Students Rank	Mean	S.D.	Faculty Rank	Mean	S.D.
12. Diversity includes difference by educational background (i.e., training and philosophy).	1	4.05	0.75	2	4.11	0.33
15. Having faculty members with varying theoretical orientations is important to me.	2	4.04	0.92	1	4.33	0.50
36. Diversity includes difference by ethnicity.	3	4.00	0.87	3.5	4.00	0.00
38. Having faculty with varying years of experience in the field is desirable.	4	3.92	0.87	5	3.89	0.60
30. Diversity includes difference by chronological age.	5	3.74	0.88	3.5	4.00	0.00
37. Diversity includes number of years experience in the field.	6	3.67	0.90	7	3.67	0.71
25. Gender is an important consideration in measuring diversity.	7	3.61	1.08	6	3.78	0.67
39. Primary language is an important element of diversity.	8	3.08	1.02	8	3.44	0.88

Table 11
Analysis of Variance of Graduate Student CAD Scores by Gender and Program Area

Source	df	MS	F	P
Between subjects	195			
Gender	1	174.28	4.46	0.04
Program	2	273.61	7.00	0.00
Gender X Program	2	17.43	0.45	0.64

Table 12
Graduate Student CAD Means by Program Areas and Gender

Gender	N	Mean	S.D.
Female	134	40.16	7.11
Male	62	38.13	4.60
Program Area	**N**	**Mean**	**S.D.**
Educational Administration	62	37.47	6.54
Counseling & Guidance	110	40.97	6.52
School Psychology	24	38.13	4.16
Overall	196	39.52	6.48

Two analyses of variance were performed on the ETH scores and are presented in Tables 13 and 14. These tables indicate that ethnic origin and program area were both related to perception regarding the lack of ethnic diversity among the faculty ($p < .0001$ and $p < .01$ respectively). Interaction effects could not be explored due to the small number of Hispanic and African-American students in the sample. A pairwise comparison of means indicated that Hispanic and African-American participants scored higher than Caucasian respondents ($p < .001$ and $p < .01$ respectively) but were not significantly different from each other (see Table 15). In addition, Counseling and Guidance students scored significantly higher than non-departmental majors ($p < .01$) indicating a stronger belief that ethnic minorities are not adequately represented among the faculty (see Table 16).

Table 13
Analysis of Variance of Graduate Student ETH by Ethnic Origin

Source	df	MS	F	P
Between subjects	218			
Ethnic Origin	2	173.27	15.24	0.0001

Table 14
Analysis of Variance of Graduate Student ETH Scores by Program Area

Source	df	MS	F	P
Between subjects	224			
Program Area	4	43.79	3.55	0.01

Table 15
Means and Standard Deviations of Graduate Student ETH Scores by Ethnic Origin

Ethnic Origin	N	Mean	S.D.
Caucasian	195	16.70	3.40
African-American	13	20.08	2.87
Hispanic	11	21.36	3.44
Overall	219	17.13	3.59

Table 16
Graduate Student ETH Means by Program Areas

Program Area	N	Mean	S.D.
Educational Administration	64	17.13	4.10
Counseling & Guidance	114	17.66	3.26
School Psychology	24	17.00	3.22
Developmental Educational	9	15.00	2.29
Other	14	14.43	3.67
Overall	200	15.40	2.85

No significant differences were found on the PLD scale based on the independent variables. This indicates that graduate students' views of the faculty's current level of diversity do not differ based on the students' gender, program area, or ethnic origin. However, t-tests conducted on seven items (9, 11, 19, 20, 24, 41, 43) with observed marked differences in student and faculty mean scores revealed significant differences on five of these items. Faculty more strongly agreed than students that the faculty represented various theoretical orientations ($p < .01$), that the ages of the faculty represented a variety of life perspectives ($p < .05$), and that an incoming student would readily recognize the faculty's diversity ($p < .05$). In addition, the faculty were more critical of themselves than students by more strongly agreeing that they are not sensitive to the issues of gays and lesbians ($p < .03$) and women's issues ($p < .02$).

Finally, the analysis of variance of the IOF scores by program area is presented in Table 18. The results indicate that the scores differed significantly based on program area ($p < .05$). A pairwise comparison of means (see Table 19) indicates that students in Developmental Education scored higher than students in programs outside the department ($p < .01$) and those in Educational Administration ($p < .05$) but not higher than Counseling and Guidance or School Psychology students. In scoring higher, Developmental Education students are indicating a stronger belief that faculty have influenced their multicultural perspectives and skills.

Table 17
Means and Standard Deviations for Graduate Student and Faculty Responses to the Items on the PLD Scale

	Students		Faculty	
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
9. My faculty represents a wide spectrum of theoretical orientations.	3.60	1.01	4.22	0.44
10. My experience with the faculty has helped me foster an appreciation for a variety of cultures other than my own.	3.17	1.05	3.44	1.13
11. There are not enough males on the faculty.	2.21	0.91	1.67	0.50
16. One reason I chose my program is because of the diversity of the faculty.	2.10	0.97	2.44	1.33
17. The faculty is multi-cultural.	2.67	1.03	2.44	0.88
18. There are not enough African-Americans on the faculty.	3.47	1.67	4.00	0.71
19. The faculty is not sensitive to the issues of gay men and lesbians.	2.55	0.86	3.22	1.09
20. The chronological ages of the faculty members represent a variety of perspectives across the life cycle.	3.21	0.99	3.89	0.78
21. The members of the faculty are not sensitive to the issues of the elderly.	2.55	0.78	2.56	0.72
22. There are not enough Hispanics on the faculty.	3.23	1.04	3.22	0.97
23. The faculty is not culturally diverse.	3.14	0.96	3.56	0.88
24. The faculty is not sensitive to women's issues.	2.35	0.89	3.11	1.05
26. The faculty's diversity has assisted me in developing skills to work with diverse populations.	3.09	0.96	2.89	0.93
27. The diversity of the faculty has motivated me to think about issues from multiple perspectives.	3.39	1.02	3.44	1.13
28. There are not enough females on the faculty.	2.73	0.94	2.67	1.00
29. The members of the faculty are not sensitive to the issues of handicapped persons.	2.49	0.79	2.07	1.00
31. Diversity among the faculty is not clearly visible.	2.98	1.04	2.56	0.73
32. There are not enough Caucasians on the faculty.	2.09	0.84	2.00	0.87
33. The members of the faculty are not noticeably different from one another.	2.46	0.96	2.44	0.88
34. The members of the faculty are not sensitive to men's issues.	2.49	0.80	2.78	0.97
35. The faculty has challenged me to examine my own multi-cultural perspectives.	3.44	1.11	3.00	1.00
41. An incoming student would readily recognize the diversity of the faculty.	2.51	0.89	3.11	0.78
43. The department's facilities (e.g., classrooms) reflect a concern for diversity.	2.62	1.03	2.11	0.78

Table 18
Analysis of Variance of Graduate Student IOF Scores by Program Area

Source	df	MS	f	P
Between subjects	221			
Program Area	4	39.28	3.07	0.02

Table 19
Graduate Student IOF Means by Program Areas

Program Area	N	Mean	S.D.
Educational Administration	65	14.95	3.79
Counseling & Guidance	112	15.27	3.48
School Psychology	23	14.91	3.78
Developmental Educational	9	18.67	2.36
Other	13	13.39	3.57
Overall	222	15.17	3.64

Discussion

The findings from this survey provide information about the present diversity of the faculty and students in the Department of Educational Administration and Psychological Services. They also provide information about how these groups view (a) the importance of faculty diversity, (b) what factors they see as constituting diversity, (c) the current perceived level of diversity, and (d) the impact of the faculty on the students' multicultural perspectives. These findings and their implications are discussed below.

Present diversity of faculty and students in EAPS

The current faculty is a fairly homogeneous group - primarily white (one African-American and one Hispanic professor), English speaking, non-disabled individuals although balanced with respect to gender. Individual program areas which do not offer a gender balance are Developmental Education with two women faculty members and Educational Administration with two female faculty members and five male faculty members. Developmental Education is the only program with an African-American faculty member.

It is noteworthy that despite the 50-50 male-female split among the faculty, 89 percent of the individuals who were willing to complete this survey were women. Due to the small size of the faculty sample, it is impossible to make any

strong inferences. However, given that 89 percent of the faculty completing surveys were women, one might conjecture that women faculty members actively show more interest in diversity issues than men, or women faculty share other characteristics that encouraged them to respond, for example, non-tenured status.

Aside from the overall gender balance, the faculty's homogeneity described above is quite apparent. It is not, however, reflected in the variety seen amongst the students who participated in the study. These students show greater diversity with respect to ethnicity (6 percent African-American, 5 percent Hispanic, and 3 percent "Other"), principal language (2 percent indicated Spanish as their principal language and .5 percent marked "Other"), and disability (8 percent). It appears, therefore, that the homogeneity of the faculty has not limited the department to a homogeneous student body although it is fully possible that greater diversity among the faculty might foster still greater diversity among the student body.

Overall, the faculty show less variability than the graduate student group in their responses to items, usually demonstrating narrower ranges and smaller standard deviations than the students. This more homogeneous view might arise from the homogeneity of the faculty described above, or it could be due to the more continuous and overt exposure the faculty has to this topic. Faculty members in the university setting (especially the EAPS area) often attend conferences, workshops and seminars on diversity and multiculturalism, thereby resulting in a "professionally correct" view of diversity. Another possible explanation may be found in the nature of the sample population. All subjects were in some way involved in the Education Administration and Psychological Services fields, fields which provide services to the plurality of the population and fields which encourage broad views and open minds. It would make sense that individuals training in these areas (i.e., the graduate students) would have more variable opinions than the faculty who are more experienced. It would be informative to compare scores of EAPS students to the scores of students in the less humanistic fields such as mathematics and science. Finally it may be that the faculty members who were willing to complete the survey also engage in other activities associated with diversity and hence are a self-selected group who share similar perspectives. We have already acknowledged that the faculty who completed the survey were primarily women. It may be that the entire faculty do not share such homogeneous views.

The importance of faculty diversity

The desirability of faculty diversity was the item most strongly endorsed by both graduate students and faculty members (see Table 6). Thus it is clear that having a diverse faculty is valued by both groups. The analysis of the IOD scale indicates that the opinions of the graduate students are more variable than those of the faculty and that the faculty tend to see diversity as somewhat more important. The results of the analysis of variance indicated that program area was related to the perception of the importance of diversity with Counseling and Guidance students attributing more importance to diversity than students in Educational Administration but not those in School Psychology. Whether this is due to a difference in training in this area, the temperament and values of those drawn to the counseling field, or the expectation of working with diverse populations warrants further investigation.

However, the most critical finding is that faculty diversity is seen as important by both students and faculty.

In addition, a trend was seen which seems important to mention. An analysis of variance of the IOD scale by ethnic group approached but did not reach significance ($p = .068$). The mean scores indicated that Hispanic graduate students ($\bar{x}=17.22$; S. D.=2.01) tend to place more value on the importance of diversity than do either Caucasian ($\bar{x}=15.25$; S. D.=2.75) or African-American ($\bar{x}=15.08$; S. D.=3.66) students. However, due to the small number of Hispanic and African-American students in this sample, further investigation is required to determine if this trend represents a meaningful difference.

Factors seen as constituting diversity

Results of the item factor analysis indicated that ethnicity, chronological age, number of years of experience, educational background (i.e., training and philosophy), gender, and theoretical orientation are all seen as factors which contribute to diversity. There is considerable overlap between the graduate students' and the faculty's perceptions; both groups include difference by educational background, theoretical orientation, and ethnicity as the most strongly endorsed elements of diversity (see Table 10). They also both indicate a strong belief that there are enough males on the faculty (see Table 6), indicating that gender is also a factor of diversity. On the other hand, the faculty felt that chronological age should be an aspect of diversity, while students more strongly endorsed number of years of experience as a desirable attribute of diversity. Faculty tended to feel more strongly than students that having faculty from varying geographic locations is important (see Table 5, Q 40).

Both groups tended to be uncertain about whether primary language, sexual orientation and tenure should be included as elements of diversity. The tenure item, however, was problematic for several reasons. First, anecdotal reports from survey administrators suggest that the term "tenure" may not have been understood by the students. Second, and more importantly, the wording of the tenure item addressed tenure as an aspect of credibility rather than as an element of diversity. One cannot, therefore, determine from these data whether having faculty at varying stages of the tenure process is seen as a desirable aspect of diversity. Finally, while students and faculty appear to endorse an equally broad definition of diversity, the faculty were more homogeneous in their responses on the CAD subscale.

The results of the analyses of variance of the student responses on the CAD subscale indicate that women (in scoring higher than men) and Counseling and Guidance students (in scoring higher than students in Educational Administration) appear to endorse a broader definition of diversity. It could be possible that women students may have already grappled with minority status and hence have a greater acceptance and sensitivity toward diversity, therefore, endorsing a broader definition. The higher scores by Counseling and Guidance students may result from a self-selection process among the students who want to counsel others, an emphasis in the Counseling and Guidance curriculum, or both.

The perceived level of diversity among current faculty

In examining the PLD subscale, the faculty once again demonstrated a narrower range of responses than did the students. Both groups, however, tended to be uncertain about the department's current, overall level of diversity. In particular, ethnic diversity was felt to be somewhat lacking with the faculty being mildly critical of their lack of ethnic diversity and the student group tending to be more uncertain (see Table 17). This uncertainty may reflect the limited perspective of "majority" students, and their subsequent lack of awareness of the benefits to be gained by greater ethnic diversity.

With respect to the presence of ethnic minorities, the faculty clearly indicated the belief that there are not enough African-American professors, while being uncertain about the amount of Hispanic faculty. A similar pattern was seen among the students, although they tended to be less decided about this issue than the faculty. The differences among the students' perceptions were related to ethnicity and program area. Hispanic and African-American students scored higher than Caucasian students on the ETH scale, indicating that they more clearly felt that the present faculty are not ethnically diverse. Counseling and Guidance students as a group are mildly critical of the department's lack of diversity in this area and scored higher than non-department majors but not higher than other students in the department.

Faculty tended to be uncertain about their own sensitivity to gay/lesbian and women's issues, but the students perceived them as mildly sensitive. Faculty and graduate students indicated a belief that the faculty are mildly sensitive to the issues of the elderly and the handicapped. Neither group indicated a strong belief that there was gender imbalance among the faculty. The faculty agreed more strongly than the students that the varying ages of the faculty added diverse perspectives.

While ethnic diversity seems to be the department's weakness, students and faculty perceive the department's strength in diversity as rooted in varying theoretical orientations. Perhaps this is why students tended to believe that incoming students would have difficulty recognizing the faculty's diversity. While both students and faculty members agree that a wide spectrum of theoretical orientations is represented among the faculty, the faculty see themselves as more varied in this area than do students. Perhaps this is due to the limited settings in which students see faculty and the higher degree of familiarity among faculty colleagues. Faculty members might want to share more directly their theoretical orientations with students so as to present more clearly the theoretical diversity of EAPS professors.

Faculty members tended to more strongly endorse the view that an incoming student would recognize the diversity of the faculty than did the student respondents. This finding could be due to the more intimate relationship between colleagues and the recognition of more subtle aspects of diversity provided by greater interpersonal familiarity. Again, it suggests that additional efforts are needed on the part of the faculty to provide information regarding their own diversity, particularly as students join the department.

An additional item seems noteworthy. Both faculty and students tended to disagree that the department's facilities, including the classrooms, reflected a concern for diversity. Perhaps this finding points to a need to enhance the

department's interior design and space to reflect sensitivity to the needs and values of all of its constituents.

The impact of faculty on the students' multicultural perspectives

Both groups were uncertain about whether the faculty and the faculty's attitudes about diversity influence the students' multicultural perspectives and skills. Developmental Education students, in scoring higher than both Educational Administration and "Other" students on the IOF scale, but not significantly higher than those in Counseling and Guidance and School Psychology, indicated a greater influence of the faculty on their own multicultural perspectives. This would be an interesting finding to explore further in light of the fact that Developmental Education is staffed by only women and has the only African-American professor, while Educational Administration has a predominance of male faculty members and no ethnic minority representation. The differences could also reflect self-selection or curriculum emphases in the Educational Administration program. All these possibilities warrant further investigation.

Summary and limitations

In summary, this study has found that although the current EAPS faculty is predominantly Caucasian, English-speaking, yet gender-balanced, the student body is more diverse. Both groups, however, view diversity as highly desirable.

These respondents' definition of diversity includes theoretical orientation, educational background (training and philosophy), ethnicity, age, years of experience, and gender. Interestingly, less important were faculty geographic background, primary language, sexual orientation, and tenure-status. While the department's strength was seen to lie in its diversity of theoretical orientations, its weakness was in ethnic diversity. Both groups also saw a need to transform facilities to reflect a value on diversity.

These findings must be viewed in light of this study's limitations. Foremost was the small number of faculty responses. Another limitation is the predominance of females in both the faculty and student samples. Also, no formal controls were introduced to ensure that duplicates of student responses were eliminated. Nevertheless, this study represents a solid, first attempt at examining faculty and student perceptions of diversity.

Recommendations for the Department

The data resulting from this survey reinforce the literature in emphasizing the importance of faculty diversity. Because both students and faculty in all programs in the Department of Educational Administration and Psychological Services attached importance to faculty diversity, it is paramount that this issue remain at the forefront of the department's future strategic planning.

Although the Committee on Faculty Diversity viewed "diversity" through a wide lens and considered many elements in its definition of "diversity," several emerged as being of uppermost concern to faculty and students. These factors included differences in educational background, theoretical orientation, ethnicity and gender. Because faculty perceive themselves as highly diverse in terms of educational background and theoretical orientation, the committee decided that the department should initially concentrate its efforts to diversify on recruiting and retaining faculty based on gender and ethnic diversity. The variety within the dimensions of educational background and theoretical orientation should be maintained and should also be shared more consciously with students to emphasize those differences. The immediate, primary criteria for diversity are recommended to consist of gender and ethnicity which constitute the first level of a two-part definition of diversity.

To ensure that these two criteria are met, the committee recommends that as new departmental vacancies occur, searches be ended before the interview process if the interview pool does not contain qualified diverse (by gender and/or ethnicity) candidates. The next new faculty member hired in the department should be a person from an ethnic minority group. In addition and more specifically, the Educational Administration Program should seek to employ a female faculty member for its next opening, and the Developmental Education Program should attempt to fill its next vacancy with a male.

Beyond this first level of definition for diversity, the committee suggests that a second level of factors be utilized as new faculty are recruited, employed and encouraged to remain at Southwest Texas State University. A candidate, having met the criteria of enhancing ethnic and gender diversity but before being offered a position, should be considered in light of the secondary elements of the definition of diversity. This second level is comprised of the other factors which would further enhance the department in elements of diversity which faculty and student survey respondents indicated as important. They are listed here in descending order of importance:

- differences in theoretical orientation;
- chronological age; and
- years of experience.

The following more specific recommendations center on efforts which the department can undertake to enhance the gender and ethnic diversity of its faculty. As individual faculty members and committees explore other issues as part of the diversification effort, additional strategies may be added to this plan to address both levels of the definition of diversity. These suggestions for action result from the review of literature included in this report and from the committee's brainstorming of strategies to enhance faculty diversity. The recommendations fall into two

categories: a) long-term to increase the numbers of potential faculty in the pipeline and b) short-term to widen the pool of applicants from diverse backgrounds. A primary concern is that both short- and long-term strategies should be constantly and consistently referenced and implemented, as enhancing the diversity of a group of faculty is an issue that easily is lost in the day-to-day workings of a department.

Building the pool of potential university faculty representing various groups obviously is a time-consuming and effortful task; however, it also has the most potential for success in immediately and permanently impacting the composition of the university faculty. Short-term strategies work only as long as diverse candidates are available; the crux of the issue of diversifying faculty lies in increasing the numbers and types of diverse individuals qualified to join a faculty and maintaining that large, diversified pool. The Department of Educational Administration and Psychological Services, in attempting over the long run to include more gender and ethnic diversity on its faculty, should:

- Conduct cultural awareness sessions for its faculty and students. As part of the professional development of faculty, opportunities should be regularly offered to examine together various aspects of cultural diversity. Additionally, students should have the same or at least parallel opportunities.
- Adapt its curricula in the various programs to include diversity and multiculturalism as strands running through all courses. Each faculty member should conduct a self-assessment of her/his course syllabi, materials, and instructional strategies to determine the degree to which diversity is reflected in classes. A committee of faculty could be established to review these self-studies and to provide private consultation to individual faculty members so that student learning opportunities in the area of embracing differences can be enhanced.
- Mentor graduate students from diverse backgrounds and actively encourage them to pursue doctoral studies. This could be done both formally and informally. For example, each faculty member could identify two graduate students considered to meet our operational definition of diversity and actively work with them to enhance their long term educational aspirations and plans. The faculty could also create a list of "diverse" students and, at the end of the students' first year, let faculty select individuals they would like to formally mentor. Informal mentoring should occur by all faculty in all classes, from showing interest and providing encouragement to offering additional resources or assisting students with networking. Additionally, these students should be tracked after they leave Southwest Texas State University to encourage them to apply for our positions and to solicit their nominations of other diverse candidates.
- Actively encourage the university to support efforts to work with middle and high schools in bringing a more diverse student body to Southwest Texas State University and to enact policies and processes to support those students throughout their higher education experience. A group of faculty and students could convene to brainstorm and plan specific activities which would strengthen these relationships among public schools, the Department of Educational Administration and Psychological Services, and other university programs and departments.
- Coordinate efforts with field-based programs which have access to middle and high school as well as undergraduate students (for example, Enhancing Diversity in Teaching, Center for Professional Development and Technology, Center for Professional Development and Technology, Center for Initiatives in

Education, Department of Curriculum and Instruction) to identify those students and to encourage them to pursue graduate study in education.

- Identify promising African-American and Hispanic graduate applicants or students in EAPS and encourage them to apply for the Regents Minority Fellowship Program.
- Identify promising minority graduate students at other institutions and support their doctoral studies in return for their agreement to join the Southwest Texas State University faculty at the conclusion of their doctoral programs.
- Employ promising graduate students from diverse backgrounds as adjunct faculty while they complete their doctoral studies.
- Offer tuition reimbursements to present faculty members who enroll in and complete courses and workshops that enhance their ability to include multicultural perspectives in their classes.
- Appoint a committee composed of faculty and students to recommend ways of reflecting diversity within the physical environment of EAPS. For example, student work and other artifacts that enhance the theme of diversity could be exhibited in our fourth floor halls. This student-faculty committee could select the items to be displayed each semester.

For the immediate future, these long-term strategies may yield few results. To fill the gap in the interim, short-term strategies to diversify the pool of candidates considered for each opening in the Department of Educational Administration and Psychological Services should include:

- Actively soliciting applications from ethnic minority and women faculty at other institutions who have tenure or are successfully working on tenure/associate professor status.
- Utilizing to their fullest potential the faculty's personal networks by having them individually contact colleagues who may be interested in our vacant positions or who might be able to nominate ethnic minority and female candidates.
- Seeking advice from the university offices and programs which recruit diverse students to the Southwest Texas State University campus.
- Offering salaries, resources for academic research, and fringe benefits which will draw ethnic minority and women candidates to apply for faculty vacancies. This strategy will require strong administrative support as the department attempts to compete with other institutions nationally.
- Ending all searches before the interview process unless the pool of those to be interviewed contains qualified diverse candidates.
- Actively seeking quality ethnic minority and women adjunct faculty who then can be encouraged to seek full-time employment when the opportunities arise.
- Tracking all unselected ethnic minority and female candidates from previous searches as well as those who decline an SWT offer and encouraging them personally to apply again.
- Seeking training for all department members in actively recruiting diverse faculty members and establishing networks with state and national ethnic and women organizations. The Affirmative Action Office should be able to deliver this training and to brainstorm with the department ways to solicit more ethnic minority and female applicants.
- Contacting ethnic and women campus groups and alumni to solicit nominations for vacancies.

- Writing job descriptions and vacancy announcements so that they are extremely broad and hence draw the widest diversity of applicants.
- Composing and distributing a short fact sheet which highlights the diversity of the present faculty at both the first (ethnicity and gender) and second (theoretical orientation, educational background, chronological age, and years of experience) levels of our definition. This fact sheet could be shared with new students at an orientation session.
- Compiling a list of opportunities across the university for support of students seeking multicultural and other diverse experiences. This information could also be shared at an orientation for students new to our programs.
- Mailing vacancy advertisements to universities with large numbers of ethnic minority and women students, to ethnic and women professional organizations, and to ethnic minority and female faculty at other institutions. The department should maintain and update this mailing list so that it is available to all search committees.

The Committee believes that enhancing the faculty's diversity is an important issue and should remain in the forefront of the department's future plans. We believe that it requires both short-term strategies aimed at widening applicant pools and long-term strategies which increase the numbers of potential faculty in the pipeline. The specific elements of diversity and the short-term and long-term recommendations offered in this report are viewed as viable means to that end and should greatly enhance the opportunities to recruit and maintain a diverse faculty.

REFERENCES

Arciniega, T. A. (1990). The Challenge of Developing Strategies to Recruit and Retain Ethnic Minority Faculty. Presented to the California Community Colleges Faculty and Staff Conference. (ED 320 516)

Astin, A. W. (1982). Minorities in American higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Brown, S. V. (1989). Minorities in the graduate education pipeline. Research report on the Minority Education (MGE) Project. (ED 299 906)

Brown, S. V. (1988). Increasing minority faculty: An elusive goal. Research report of the Minority Education (MGE) Project. (ED 299 904)

Bunzel, J. H. (1990). Minority faculty hiring. The American Scholar, 59, 39-52.

California Community Colleges: Chancellor's Office. (1989). Toward a new diversity: A state plan for affirmative action and staff diversity in the California community colleges. (Discussion draft). Sacramento, CA: California Community Colleges.

California Community Colleges: Chancellor's Office. (1989). Toward a new diversity: Guidelines for a staff diversity: Affirmative action plan. Sacramento, CA: California Community Colleges.

Ching, L. L. (1990). Recognizing diversity. American Behavioral Scientist, 34, 263-278.

Gibbs, J. T., Huang, L. N., & Associates (Eds.). (1989). Children of color: Psychological interventions with minority youth. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Henry, S. D. (1985). Toward a theory of the desegregation of the workplace. The Black Scholar, 16, 23-30.

Kappner, A. S. (1991) The role of leadership in planning and implementing diversity. New York: Paper presented at the 71st Annual American Association of Community and Junior Colleges Convention (AACJC). (ED 333 910)

Lessow-Hurley, J. (1989). Recruitment and retention of minority faculty; Affirmative action strategies. CUPA Journal, 40, 22-26.

Linthicum, D. S. (1989). The dry pipeline: Increasing the flow of minority faculty. Report prepared for the National Council of State Directors of Community/Junior Colleges. (ED 307 950)

Mazingo, S. (1987). More efforts needed to retain and promote minority faculty. Educator, 41, 34-36.

Menges, R. J. and Exum, W. H. (1983). Barriers to the progress of women and minority faculty. Journal of Higher Education, 54, 123-144.

Moses, Y. T. (1989). Black women in academe: Issues and strategies. Washington, D. C.: Project on the Status and Education of Women. (ED 311 817).

Office of Institutional Research and Planning, personal communication, February 9, 1994.

Ogbu, J. U. (1990). Minority education comparative perspective. Journal of Negro Education, 59, 45-47.

Richardson, R. C. (1989). Serving more diverse students: A contextual view. Minority Achievement: Counting on you. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. (ED 318 365)

Schon, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner. New York: Basic Books.

Scott, R. A. (1992). Developing diversity as a campus strength. Washington, D. C.: Paper presented at the annual meeting of The Association of American Colleges.

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. (1992). Search Guidelines to Enhance Diversity. Austin, TX: Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.

The National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities. (1991). Pluralism in the professoriate: Strategies for developing faculty diversity. Washington, D. C.: The National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities.

APPENDIX A
Student Questionnaire

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. YOUR GENDER:
   A. Female
   B. Male

2. YOUR ETHNIC ORIGIN:
   A. Caucasian
   B. African American
   C. Hispanic
   D. Asian American
   E. Other _____

3. YOUR AGE:
   A. 20 -30
   B. 31 - 40
   C. 41 - 50
   D. 51 - 60
   E. 60+

4. YOUR PROGRAM:
   A. Ed. Adm.
   B. Couns & Guidance
   C. School Psy
   D. Dev. Ed
   E. Other _____

5. NUMBER OF SEMESTER HOURS COMPLETED
   A. 0 - 9
   B. 10 - 18
   C. 19 - 27
   D. 28 - 37
   E. 39 - 45

6. DO YOU HAVE A DISABILITY?
   A. Yes _____
   B. No

7. PRINCIPAL LANGUAGE:
   A. English
   B. Spanish
   C. Other _____

PLEASE CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS AND MARK THE ANSWER SHEET BASED ON YOUR EXPERIENCE IN YOUR PROGRAM AT SWT

A. STRONGLY DISAGREE B. DISAGREE C. UNDECIDED

D. AGREE E. STRONGLY AGREE

8. The diversity of the faculty is important to me.

9. My faculty represents a wide spectrum of theoretical orientations.

10. My experience with the faculty has helped me foster an appreciation for a variety of cultures other than my own.

11. There are not enough males on the faculty.

12. Diversity includes difference by educational background (i.e., training and philosophy).

13. Diversity is desirable in the graduate faculty.

14. Tenure increases a faculty member's credibility with students.

15. Having faculty members with varying theoretical orientations is important to me.

16. One reason I chose my program is because of the diversity of the faculty.

17. The faculty is multi-cultural.

18. There are not enough African Americans on the faculty.

19. The faculty is not sensitive to the issues of gay men and lesbians.

20. The chronological ages of the faculty members represent a variety of perspectives across the life cycle.

21. The members of the faculty are not sensitive to the issues of the elderly.

22. There are not enough Hispanics on the faculty.

23. The faculty is not culturally diverse.

24. The faculty is not sensitive to women's issues.

25. Gender is an important consideration in measuring diversity.

26. The faculty's diversity has assisted me in developing skills to work with diverse populations.

27. The diversity of the faculty has motivated me to think about issues from multiple perspectives.

28. There are not enough females on the faculty.

29. The members of the faculty are not sensitive to the issues of handicapped persons.

30. Diversity includes difference by chronological age.

31. Diversity among the faculty is not clearly visible.

32. There are not enough Caucasians on the faculty.

33. The members of the faculty are not noticeably different one from the other.

34. The members of the faculty are not sensitive to men's issues.

35. The faculty has challenged me to examine my own multi-cultural perspectives.

36. Diversity includes difference by ethnicity.

37. Diversity includes number of years of experience in the field.

38. Having faculty with varying years of experience in the field is desirable.

39. Primary language is an important element of diversity.

40. Having faculty from varying regions of the country is important to me.

41. An incoming student would readily recognize the diversity of the faculty.

42. Having a faculty member who is a gay male or lesbian would enhance faculty diversity.

43. The department's facilities (e.g., classrooms) reflect a concern for diversity.

YOUR COMMENTS:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS EFFORT.

APPENDIX B
Faculty Questionnaire

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. YOUR GENDER:
   A. Female
   B. Male

2. YOUR ETHNIC ORIGIN:
   A. Caucasian
   B. African American
   C. Hispanic
   D. Asian American
   E. Other _____

3. YOUR AGE:
   A. 20 -30
   B. 31 - 40
   C. 41 - 50
   D. 51 - 60
   E. 60+

4. YOUR PROGRAM:
   A. Ed. Adm.
   B. Couns & Guidance
   C. School Psy
   D. Dev. Ed.
   E. Other _____

5. YEARS OF SERVICE AT SWT:
   A. 0 - 5
   B. 6 - 10
   C. 11 - 15
   D. 16 - 20
   E. 20+

6. DO YOU HAVE A DISABILITY?
   A. Yes _____
   B. No

7. PRINCIPAL LANGUAGE:
   A. English
   B. Spanish
   C. Other _____

PLEASE CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS AND MARK THE ANSWER SHEET BASED ON YOUR EXPERIENCE IN YOUR PROGRAM AT SWT

A. STRONGLY DISAGREE B. DISAGREE C. UNDECIDED

D. AGREE E. STRONGLY AGREE

25. Gender is an important consideration in measuring diversity.

26. The faculty's diversity has assisted me in developing skills to work with diverse populations.

27. The diversity of the faculty has motivated me to think about issues from multiple perspectives.

28. There are not enough females on the faculty.

29. The members of the faculty are not sensitive to the issues of handicapped persons.

30. Diversity includes difference by chronological age.

31. Diversity among the faculty is not clearly visible.

32. There are not enough Caucasians on the faculty.

33. The members of the faculty are not noticeably different one from the other.

34. The members of the faculty are not sensitive to men's issues.

35. The faculty has challenged me to examine my own multi-cultural perspectives.

36. Diversity includes difference by ethnicity.

37. Diversity includes number of years of experience in the field.

38. Having faculty with varying years of experience in the field is desirable.

39. Primary language is an important element of diversity.

40. Having faculty from varying regions of the country is important to me.

41. An incoming student would readily recognize the diversity of the faculty.

42. Having a faculty member who is a gay male or lesbian would enhance faculty diversity.

43. The department's facilities (e.g., classrooms) reflect a concern for diversity.

YOUR COMMENTS:

APPENDIX C
Descriptive Summary of the Faculty's Responses to Each Item

Table 1
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 8
"The diversity of the faculty is important to me."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	0	0	1	5	2
	%	0	0	12.50	62.50	25.00
Male	N	0	0	0	1	0
		0	0	100.00	0	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	0	0	1	1
	%	0	0	0	50.00	50.00
41-50	N	0	0	1	4	0
	%	0	0	20.00	80.00	0
51-60	N	0	0	0	0	1
	%	0	0	0	0	100.00
60+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%.	0	0	0	100.00	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	0	0	3	1
	%	0	0	0	75.00	25.00
6-10	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
11-15	N	0	0	1	0	0
	%	0	0	100.00	0	0
16-20	N	0	0	0	1	1
	%	0	0	0	50.00	50.00
20+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
TOTAL	N	0	0	1	6	2
	%	0	0	11.11	66.67	22.22

N=9
$\overline{X}$=4.11
SD=0.60

Table 2
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 9
"My faculty represents a wide spectrum of theoretical orientations."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	0	0	0	6	2
	%	0	0	0	75.00	25.00
Male	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	0	0	2	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
41-50	N	0	0	0	4	1
	%	0	0	0	80.00	20.00
51-60	N	0	0	0	0	1
	%	0	0	0	0	100.00
60+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	0	0	4	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
6-10	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
11-15	N	0	0	0	0	1
	%	0	0	0	0	100.00
16-20	N	0	0	0	1	1
	%	0	0	0	50.00	50.00
20+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
TOTAL	N	0	0	0	7	2
	%	0	0	0	77.78	22.22

$N=9$
$\bar{X}=4.22$
$SD=0.44$

Table 3
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 10
"My experience with the faculty has helped me foster an appreciation for a variety of cultures other than my own."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	0	0	3	4	1
	%	0	0	37.50	50.00	12.50
Male	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	0	0	1	1
	%	0	0	0	50.00	50.00
41-50	N	0	0	3	2	0
	%	0	0	60.00	40.00	0
51-60	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
60+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	0	2	2	0
	%	0	0	50.00	50.00	0
6-10	N	0	0	1	0	0
	%	0	0	100.00	0	0
11-15	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
16-20	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
20+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
TOTAL	N	0	0	3	5	1
	%	0	0	33.33	55.56	11.11

N=9
$\bar{X}$=3.44
SD=1.13

Table 4
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 11
"There are not enough males on the faculty."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	3	5	0	0	0
	%	37.50	62.50	0	0	0
Male	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	2	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
41-50	N	2	3	0	0	0
	%	40.00	60.00	0	0	0
51-60	N	1	0	0	0	0
	%	100.00	0	0	0	0
60+	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	2	2	0	0	0
	%	50.00	50.00	0	0	0
6-10	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
11-15	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
16-20	N	1	1	0	0	0
	%	50.00	50.00	0	0	0
20+	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
TOTAL	N	3	6	0	0	0
	%	33.33	66.67	0	0	0

N=9
$\bar{X}$=1.67
SD=0.50

Table 5
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 12
"Diversity includes difference by educational background (i.e., training and philosophy)."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	0	0	0	7	1
	%	0	0	0	87.50	12.50
Male	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	0	0	2	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
41-50	N	0	0	0	4	1
	%	0	0	0	80.00	20.00
51-60	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
60+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	0	0	3	1
	%	0	0	0	75.00	25.00
6-10	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
11-15	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
16-20	N	0	0	0	2	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
20+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
TOTAL	N	0	0	0	8	1
	%	0	0	0	88.89	11.11

N=9
$\bar{X}$=4.11
SD=0.33

Table 6
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 13
"Diversity is desirable in the graduate faculty."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	0	0	0	3	5
	%	0	0	0	37.50	62.50
Male	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	0	0	1	1
	%	0	0	0	50.00	50.00
41-50	N	0	0	0	2	3
	%	0	0	0	40.00	60.00
51-60	N	0	0	0	0	1
	%	0	0	0	0	100.00
60+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	0	0	2	2
	%	0	0	0	50.00	50.00
6-10	N	0	0	0	0	1
	%	0	0	0	0	100.00
11-15	N	0	0	0	0	1
	%	0	0	0	0	100.00
16-20	N	0	0	0	1	1
	%	0	0	0	50.00	50.00
20+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
TOTAL	N	0	0	0	4	5
	%	0	0	0	44.44	55.56

N=9
$\bar{X}$=4.56
SD=0.53

Table 7
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 14
"Tenure increases a faculty member's credibility with students."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	1	4	2	0	1
	%	12.50	50.00	25.000	0	12.50
Male	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	2	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
41-50	N	1	1	2	0	1
	%	20.00	20.00	40.00	0	20.00
51-60	N	0	1	0	1	0
	%	0	50.00	0	50.00	0
60+	N	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0	0	0	0	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	1	2	0	1
	%	0	25.00	50.00	0	25.00
6-10	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
11-15	N	1	0	0	0	0
	%	100.00	0	0	0	0
16-20	N	0	2	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
20+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
TOTAL	N	1	4	2	1	1
	%	11.11	44.44	22.22	11.11	11.11

N=9
$\bar{X}$=2.67
SD=1.23

Table 8
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 15
"Having faculty members with varying theoretical orientation is important to me."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	0	0	0	5	3
	%	0	0	0	62.50	37.53
Male	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	0	0	1	1
	%	0	0	0	50.00	50.00
41-50	N	0	0	0	3	2
	%	0	0	0	60.00	40.00
51-60	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
60+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	0	0	3	1
	%	0	0	0	75.00	25.00
6-10	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
11-15	N	0	0	0	0	1
	%	0	0	0	0	100.00
16-20	N	0	0	0	1	1
	%	0	0	0	50.00	50.00
20+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
TOTAL	N	0	0	0	6	3
	%	0	0	0	66.67	33.33

N=9
$\bar{X}$=4.33
SD=0.50

Table 9
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 16
"One reason I chose my program is because of the diversity of the faculty."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	2	3	1	1	1
	%	25.00	37.50	12.50	12.50	12.50
Male	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	1	1	0	0
	%	0	50.00	50.00	0	0
41-50	N	1	2	0	1	1
	%	20.00	40.00	0	20.00	20.00
51-60	N	1	0	0	0	0
	%	100.00	0	0	0	0
60+	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	2	1	1	0
	%	0	50.00	25.00	25.00	0
6-10	N	1	0	0	0	0
	%	100.00	0	0	0	0
11-15	N	0	0	0	0	1
	%	0	0	0	0	100.00
16-20	N	1	1	0	0	0
	%	50.00	50.00	0	0	0
20+	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
TOTAL	N	2	4	1	1	1
	%	22.22	44.44	11.11	11.11	11.11

N=9
$\bar{X}$=2.44
SD=1.33

Table 10
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 17
"The faculty is multi-cultured."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	0	6	0	2	0
	%	0	75.00	0	25.00	0
Male	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	2	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
41-50	N	0	4	0	1	0
	%	0	80.00	0	20.00	0
51-60	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
60+	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	3	0	1	0
	%	0	75.00	0	25.00	0
6-10	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
11-15	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
16-20	N	0	1	0	1	0
	%	0	50.00	0	50.00	0
20+	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
TOTAL	N	0	7	0	2	0
	%	0	77.78	0	22.22	0

N=9
$\bar{X}$=2.44
SD=0.88

Table 11
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 18
"There are not enough African-Americans on the faculty."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	0	0	2	5	2
	%	0	0	12.50	62.50	12.50
Male	N	0	0	1	0	0
	%	0	0	100.00	0	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	0	0	1	1
	%	0	0	0	50.00	50.00
41-50	N	0	0	1	3	1
	%	0	0	20.00	60.00	20.00
51-60	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
60+	N	0	0	1	0	0
	%	0	0	100.00	0	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	0	0	3	1
	%	0	0	0	75.00	25.00
6-10	N	0	0	0	0	1
	%	0	0	0	0	100.00
11-15	N	0	0	1	0	0
	%	0	0	100.00	0	0
16-20	N	0	0	0	2	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
20+	N	0	0	1	0	0
	%	0	0	100.00	0	0
TOTAL	N	0	0	2	5	2
	%	0	0	22.22	55.56	22.22

N=9
$\bar{X}$=4.00
SD=0.71

Table 12
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 19
"The faculty is not sensitive to the issues of gay men and lesbians."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	1	1	1	5	0
	%	12.50	12.50	12.50	62.50	0
Male	N	0	0	1	0	0
	%	0	0	100.00	0	0
Age						
31-40	N	1	0	0	1	0
	%	50.00	0	0	50.00	0
41-50	N	0	1	1	3	0
	%	0	20.00	20.00	60.00	0
51-60	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
60+	N	0	0	1	0	0
	%	0	0	100.00	0	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	0	1	3	0
	%	0	0	25.00	75.00	0
6-10	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
11-15	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
16-20	N	1	0	0	1	0
	%	50.00	0	0	50.00	0
20+	N	0	0	1	0	0
	%	0	0	100.00	0	0
TOTAL	N	1	1	2	5	0
	%	11.11	11.11	22.22	55.56	0

N=9
$\bar{X}$=3.22
SD=1.09

Table 13
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 20
"The chronological ages of the faculty members represent a variety of perspectives across the life cycle."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	0	1	0	6	1
	%	0	12.50	0	75.00	12.50
Male	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	0	0	2	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
41-50	N	0	1	0	3	1
	%	0	25.00	0	75.00	0
51-60	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
60+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	0	0	4	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
6-10	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
11-15	N	0	0	0	0	1
	%	0	0	0	0	100.00
16-20	N	0	0	0	2	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
20+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
TOTAL	N	0	1	0	7	1
	%	0	11.11	0	77.78	11.11

N=9
$\bar{X}$=3.89
SD=0.78

Table 14
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 21
"The faculty is not sensitive to the issues of the elderly."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	0	4	3	1	0
	%	0	50.00	37.50	12.50	0
Male	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	1	0	1	0
	%	0	50.00	0	50.00	0
41-50	N	0	2	3	0	0
	%	0	40.00	60.00	0	0
51-60	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
60+	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	0	3	1	0
	%	0	0	75.00	25.00	0
6-10	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
11-15	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
16-20	N	0	2	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
20+	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
TOTAL	N	0	5	3	1	0
	%	0	55.56	33.33	11.11	0

N=9
$\bar{X}$=2.56
SD=0.73

Table 15
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 22
"There are not enough Hispanics on the faculty."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	0	2	1	5	0
	%	0	22.22	11.11	55.56	0
Male	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	0	0	2	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
41-50	N	0	2	1	2	0
	%	0	40.00	20.00	40.00	0
51-60	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
60+	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	2	0	2	0
	%	0	50.00	0	50.00	0
6-10	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
11-15	N	0	0	1	0	0
	%	0	0	100.00	0	0
16-20	N	0	0	0	2	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
20+	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
TOTAL	N	0	3	1	5	0
	%	0	33.33	11.11	55.56	0

N=9
$\bar{X}$=3.22
SD=0.97

Table 16
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 23
"The faculty are not culturally diverse."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	0	1	0	7	0
	%	0	12.50	0	87.50	0
Male	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	0	0	2	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
41-50	N	0	0	0	5	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
51-60	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
60+	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	1	0	4	0
	%	0	20.00	0	80.00	0
6-10	N	0	1	0	1	0
	%	0	50.00	0	50.00	0
11-15	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
16-20	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
20+	N	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	N	0	2	0	7	0
	%	0	22.22	0	77.78	0

N=9
$\bar{X}$=3.56
SD=0.88

Table 17
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 24
"The members of the faculty are not sensitive to women's issues."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	1	0	3	4	0
	%	12.50	0	37.50	50.00	0
Male	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	0	0	2	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
41-50	N	1	0	3	1	0
	%	20.00	0	60.00	20.00	0
51-60	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
60+	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	0	3	1	0
	%	0	0	75.00	25.00	0
6-10	N	1	0	0	0	0
	%	100.00	0	0	0	0
11-15	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
16-20	N	0	0	0	2	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
20+	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
TOTAL	N	1	1	3	4	0
	%	11.11	11.11	33.33	44.44	0

N=9
$\bar{X}$=3.11
SD=1.05

Table 18
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 25
"Gender is an important consideration in measuring diversity."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	0	1	0	7	0
	%	0	12.50	0	87.50	0
Male	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	0	0	2	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
41-50	N	0	1	0	4	0
	%	0	20.00	0	80.00	0
51-60	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
60+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	0	0	4	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
6-10	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
11-15	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
16-20	N	0	0	0	2	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
20+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
TOTAL	N	0	1	0	8	0
	%	0	11.11	0	88.89	0

N=9
$\overline{X}$=3.78
SD=0.67

Table 19
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 26
"The faculty's diversity has assisted me in developing skills to work with diverse populations."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N		4	2	2	0
	%		50.00	25.00	25.00	0
Male	N		0	0	1	0
	%		0	0	100.00	0
Age						
31-40	N		0	1	1	0
	%		0	50.00	50.00	0
41-50	N		3	1	1	0
	%		60.00	20.00	20.00	0
51-60	N		1	0	0	0
	%		100.00	0	0	0
60+	N		0	0	1	0
	%		0	0	100.00	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N		2	1	1	0
	%		50.00	25.00	25.00	0
6-10	N		1	0	0	0
	%		100.00	0	0	0
11-15	N		0	1	0	0
	%		0	100.00	0	0
16-20	N		1	0	1	0
	%		50.00	0	50.00	0
20+	N		0	0	1	0
	%		0	0	100.00	0
TOTAL	N		4	2	3	0
	%		44.44	22.22	33.33	0

N=9
$\overline{X}$=2.89
SD=0.93

Table 20
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 27
"The diversity of the faculty has motivated me to think about issues from multiple perspectives."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	0	3	0	4	1
	%	0	37.50	0	50.00	12.50
Male	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	0	0	2	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
41-50	N	0	3	0	1	1
	%	0	60.00	0	20.00	20.00
51-60	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
60+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	2	0	1	1
	%	0	50.00	0	25.00	25.00
6-10	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
11-15	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
16-20	N	0	0	0	2	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
20+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
TOTAL	N	0	3	0	5	1
	%	0	33.33	0	55.56	11.11

N=9
$\bar{X}$=3.44
SD=1.13

Table 21
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 28
"There are not enough females on the faculty."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	0	5	0	3	0
	%	0	62.50	0	37.50	0
Male	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	2	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
41-50	N	0	3	0	2	0
	%	0	60.00	0	40.00	0
51-60	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	.0	0	100.00	0
60+	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	3	0	1	0
	%	0	75.00	0	25.00	0
6-10	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
11-15	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
16-20	N	0	1	0	1	0
	%	0	50.00	0	50.00	0
20+	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
TOTAL	N	0	6	0	3	0
	%	0	66.67	0	33.33	0

N=9
$\bar{X}$=2.67
SD=1.00

Table 22
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 29
"The members of the faculty are not sensitive to the issues of handicapped persons."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	1	2	3	2	0
	%	12.58	25.00	37.50	25.00	0
Male	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	1	0	1	0
	%	0	50.00	0	50.00	0
41-50	N	1	1	3	0	0
	%	20.00	20.00	60.00	0	0
51-60	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
60+	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	0	3	1	0
	%	0	0	75.00	25.00	0
6-10	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
11-15	N	1	0	0	0	0
	%	100.00	0	0	0	0
16-20	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	50.00	0	0	0
20+	N	0	1	0	1	0
	%	0	50.00	0	50.00	0
TOTAL	N	1	3	3	2	0
	%	11.11	33.33	33.33	22.22	0

N=9
$\bar{X}$=2.67
SD=1.00

Table 23
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 30
"Diversity includes differences by chronological age."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	0	0	0	8	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Male	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	0	0	2	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
41-50	N	0	0	0	5	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
51-60	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
60+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	0	0	4	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
6-10	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
11-15	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
16-20	N	0	0	0	2	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
20+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
TOTAL	N	0	0	0	9	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0

N=9
$\bar{X}$=4.00
SD=0.00

Table 24
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 31
"Diversity among the faculty is not clearly visible."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	0	5	3	0	0
	%	0	62.50	37.50	0	0
Male	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	0	2	0	0
	%	0	0	100.00	0	0
41-50	N	0	4	1	0	0
	%	0	80.00	20.00	0	0
51-60	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
60+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	2	2	0	0
	%	0	50.00	50.00	0	0
6-10	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
11-15	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
16-20	N	0	1	1	0	0
	%	0	50.00	50.00	0	0
20+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
TOTAL	N	0	5	3	1	0
	%	0	55.56	33.33	11.11	0

N=9
$\bar{X}$=2.56
SD=0.73

Table 25
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 32
"There are not enough Caucasians on the faculty."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	2	5	0	1	0
	%	25.00	62.50	0	12.50	0
Male	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
Age						
31-40	N	1	0	0	1	0
	%	50.00	0	0	50.00	0
41-50	N	1	4	0	0	0
	%	20.00	80.00	0	0	0
51-60	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
60+	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	1	3	0	0	0
	%	25.00	75.00	0	0	0
6-10	N	1	0	0	0	0
	%	100.00	0	0	0	0
11-15	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
16-20	N	0	1	0	1	0
	%	0	50.00	0	50.00	0
20+	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
TOTAL	N	2	6	0	1	0
	%	22.22	66.67	0	11.11	0

N=9
$\bar{X}$=2.00
SD=0.87

Table 26
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 33
"Members of the faculty are not noticeably different from one another."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	0	6	0	2	0
	%	0	75.00	0	25.00	0
Male	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	2	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
41-50	N	0	3	0	2	0
	%	0	60.00	0	40.00	0
51-60	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
60+	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	2	0	2	0
	%	0	50.00	0	50.00	0
6-10	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
11-15	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
16-20	N	0	2	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
20+	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
TOTAL	N	0	7	0	2	0
	%	0	77.78	0	22.22	0

N=9
$\bar{X}$=2.44
SD=0.88

Table 27
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 34
"The members of the faculty are not sensitive to men's issues."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	0	3	4	0	1
	%	0	37.50	50.00	0	12.50
Male	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	1	1	0	0
	%	0	50.00	50.00	0	0
41-50	N	0	1	3	0	1
	%	0	20.00	60.00	0	20.00
51-60	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
60+	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	1	3	0	0
	%	0	25.00	75.00	0	0
6-10	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
11-15	N	0	0	0	0	1
	%	0	0	0	0	100.00
16-20	N	0	1	1	0	0
	%	0	50.00	50.00	0	0
20+	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
TOTAL	N	0	4	4	0	1
	%	0	44.44	44.44	0	11.11

N=9
$\bar{X}$=2.78
SD=0.97

Table 28
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 35 "The faculty has challenged me to examine my own multi-cultural perspectives."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	0	4	1	3	0
	%	0	50.00	12.50	37.50	0
Male	N	0	1	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	0	0	2	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
41-50	N	0	3	1	1	0
	%	0	60.00	20.00	20.00	0
51-60	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
60+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0		0	2	0
	%	0		0	100.00	0
6-10	N	0	2	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
11-15	N	0	1	1	0	0
	%	0	50.00	50.00	0	0
16-20	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
20+	N	0	1	0	1	0
	%	0	50.00	0	50.00	0
TOTAL	N	0	4	4	0	1
	%	0	44.44	44.44	0	11.11

N=9
$\bar{X}$=3.00
SD=1.00

Table 29
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 36
"Diversity includes difference by ethnicity."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	0	0	0	8	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Male	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	0	0	2	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
41-50	N	0	0	0	5	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
51-60	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
60+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	0	0	4	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
6-10	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
11-15	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
16-20	N	0	0	0	2	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
20+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
TOTAL	N	0	0	0	9	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0

N=9
$\bar{X}$=4.00
SD=0.00

Table 30
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 37
"Diversity includes number of years experience in the field."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	0	1	1	6	0
	%	0	12.50	12.50	75.00	0
Male	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	0	0	2	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
41-50	N	0	1	0	4	0
	%	0	20.00	0	80.00	0
51-60	N	0	0	1	0	0
	%	0	0	100.00	0	0
60+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	0	0	4	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
6-10	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
11-15	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
16-20	N	0	0	1	1	0
	%	0	0	50.00	50.00	0
20+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
TOTAL	N	0	1	1	7	0
	%	0	11.11	11.11	77.78	0

N=9
$\bar{X}$=3.67
SD=0.71

Table 31
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 38
"Having faculty with varying years of experience in the field is desirable."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	0	0	2	5	1
	%	0	0	25.00	62.50	12.50
Male	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	0	1	1	0
	%	0	0	50.00	50.00	0
41-50	N	0	0	0	4	1
	%	0	0	0	80.00	20.00
51-60	N	0	0	1	0	0
	%	0	0	100.00	0	0
60+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	0	0	4	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
6-10	N	0	0	0	0	1
	%	0	0	0	0	100.00
11-15	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
16-20	N	0	0	2	0	0
	%	0	0	100.00	0	0
20+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
TOTAL	N	0	0	2	6	1
	%	0	0	22.22	66.67	11.11

N=9
$\bar{X}$=3.89
SD=0.60

Table 32
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 39
"Primary language is an important element of diversity."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	0	2	1	5	0
	%	0	25.00	12.50	62.50	0
Male	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	0	1	1	0
	%	0	0	50.00	50.00	0
41-50	N	0	2	0	3	0
	%	0	40.00	0	60.00	0
51-60	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
60+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	1	1	2	0
	%	0	25.00	25.00	50.00	0
6-10	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
11-15	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
16-20	N	0	0	0	2	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
20+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
TOTAL	N	0	2	1	6	0
	%	0	22.22	11.11	66.67	0

N=9
$\bar{X}$=3.44
SD=0.88

Table 33
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 40
"Having faculty from varying regions of the country is important."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	0	1	1	4	2
	%	0	12.50	12.50	50.00	25.00
Male	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	0	0	1	1
	%	0	0	0	50.00	50.00
41-50	N	0	0	1	3	1
	%	0	0	20.00	60.00	20.00
51-60	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
60+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	0	0	4	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
6-10	N	0	0	1	0	0
	%	0	0	100.00	0	0
11-15	N	0	0	0	0	1
	%	0	0	0	0	100.00
16-20	N	0	1	0	0	1
	%	0	50.00	0	0	50.00
20+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
TOTAL	N	0	1	1	5	2
	%	0	11.11	11.11	55.56	22.22

N=9
$\bar{X}$=3.89
SD=0.93

Table 34
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 41
"An incoming student would readily recognize the diversity of the faculty."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	0	1	4	3	0
	%	0	12.50	50.00	37.50	0
Male	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	0	2	0	0
	%	0	0	100.00	0	0
41-50	N	0	1	2	2	0
	%	0	20.00	40.00	40.00	0
51-60	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
60+	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	0	2	2	0
	%	0	0	50.00	50.00	0
6-10	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
11-15	N	0	0	1	0	0
	%	0	0	100.00	0	0
16-20	N	0	0	1	1	0
	%	0	0	50.00	50.00	0
20+	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
TOTAL	N	0	2	4	3	0
	%	0	22.22	44.44	33.33	0

N=9
$\bar{X}$=3.11
SD=0.78

Table 35
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 42
"Having a faculty member who is a gay male or lesbian would enhance faculty diversity."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	1	1	0	5	1
	%	12.50	12.50	0	62.50	12.50
Male	N	0	0	1	0	0
	%	0	0	100.00	0	0
Age						
31-40	N	0	0	0	1	1
	%	0	0	0	50.00	50.00
41-50	N	1	1	0	3	0
	%	20.00	20.00	0	60.00	0
51-60	N	0	0	0	1	
	%	0	0	0	100.00	
60+	N	0	0	0	1	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	0	0	4	0
	%	0	0	0	100.00	0
6-10	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
11-15	N	1	0	0	0	0
	%	100.00	0	0	0	0
16-20	N	0	0	0	1	1
	%	0	0	0	50.00	50.00
20+	N	0	0	1	0	0
	%	0	0	100.00	0	0
TOTAL	N	1	1	1	5	1
	%	11.11	11.11	11.11	55.56	11.11

N=9
$\bar{X}$=3.44
SD=1.24

Table 36
Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Question 43 "The department's facilities (e.g., classrooms) reflect a concern for diversity."

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Gender						
Female	N	2	4	2	0	0
	%	25.00	50.00	25.00	0	0
Male	N	0	0	1	0	0
	%	0	0	100.00	0	0
Age						
31-40	N	1	1	0	0	0
	%	50.00	50.00	0	0	0
41-50	N	1	2	2	0	0
	%	20.00	40.00	40.00	0	0
51-60	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0	100.00	0	0	0
60+	N	0	0	1	0	0
	%	0	0	100.00	0	0
Years of Service						
0-5	N	0	3	1	0	0
	%	0	75.00	25.00	0	0
6-10	N	1	0	0	0	0
	%	100.00	0	0	0	0
11-15	N	0	0	1	0	0
	%	0	0	100.00	0	0
16-20	N	1	1	0	0	0
	%	50.00	50.00	0	0	0
20+	N	0	0	1	0	0
	%	0	0	100.00	0	0
TOTAL	N	2	4	3	0	0
	%	22.22	44.44	33.33	0	0

N=9
$\bar{X}$=2.11
SD=0.78